arXiv:1612.01681v1 [math.CO] 6 Dec 2016

# UNITIFICATION OF WEAKLY P. Q.-BAER $*$-RINGS

Anil Khairnar
Department of Mathematics, Abasaheb Garware College, Pune-411004, India.
*anil.khairnar@mesagc.org; anil_maths2004@yahoo.com*

B. N. Waphare
Center for Advanced Studies in Mathematics, Department of Mathematics,
Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune-411007, India.
*bnwaph@math.unipune.ac.in; waphare@yahoo.com*

Abstract. In this paper, we introduce a concept of weakly principally quasi-Baer $*$-rings in terms of central cover. We prove that a $*$-ring is a principally quasi-Baer $*$-ring if and only if it is weakly principally quasi-Baer $*$-ring with unity. A partial solution to the problem similar to unitification problem raised by S. K. Berberian is obtained.

**Keywords:** weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings, p.q.-Baer $*$-rings, Rickart $*$-rings, Baer $*$-rings.

## 1. Introduction

Throughout this paper, $R$ denotes an associative ring. A $*$-ring (ring with involution) $R$ is a ring equipped with an involution $x \to x^*$, that is an additive anti-automorphism of period at most two. An element $e$ in a $*$-ring $R$ is called a *projection* if it is self adjoint (i.e., $e = e^*$) and *idempotent* (i.e., $e^2 = e$). Let $S$ be a nonempty subset of $R$. We write $r_R(S) = \{a \in R \mid sa = 0,\ \forall\ s \in S\}$, called the *right annihilator* of $S$ in $R$, and $l_R(S) = \{a \in R \mid as = 0,\ \forall\ s \in S\}$, called the *left annihilator* of $S$ in $R$. For projections $e, f$, we write $e \leq f$ in case $e = ef$. By [2, Proposition 1, page 4], the relation $\leq$ is a partial order relation on the set of projections in a $*$-ring.

In [9], Kaplansky introduced Baer rings and Baer $*$-rings to abstract various properties of $AW^*$-algebras, von Neumann algebras and complete $*$-regular rings. A $*$-ring $R$ is said to be a *Baer $*$-ring*, if for every nonempty subset $S$ of $R$, $r_R(S) = eR$, where $e$ is a projection in $R$. Herstien was convinced that the simplicity of the simple Lie algebra should follow solely from the fact that $R = M_n(F)$ ($F$-a field) is a simple ring. This led him in the 1950's to develop his Lie theory of arbitrary simple rings with involutions. Early motivation for studying $*$-rings came from rings of operators. If $\mathscr{B}(H)$ is the set of all bounded linear operators on a (real or complex) Hilbert space $H$, then each $\phi \in \mathscr{B}(H)$ has an adjoint, $adj(\phi) \in \mathscr{B}(H)$, and $\phi \to adj(\phi)$ is an involution on the ring $\mathscr{B}(H)$.

According to Birkenmeier et al. [6], a $*$-ring $R$ is said to be a *quasi-Baer $*$-ring* if the right annihilator of every ideal of $R$ is generated, as a right ideal, by a projection in $R$. In the same paper [6], they provide examples of Baer rings which are quasi-Baer $*$-rings but not Baer $*$-rings. In [2], Berberian developed the theory of Baer $*$-rings and Rickart (p.p.) $*$-rings.

The following definitions are required in sequel, can be found in [2]. A $*$-ring $R$ is said to be a *Rickart $*$-ring*, if for each $x \in R$, $r_R(\{x\}) = eR$, where $e$ is a projection in $R$. For each element $a$ in a Rickart $*$-ring, there is unique projection $e$ such that $ae = a$ and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16W10; Secondary 16D25 .

$ax = 0$ if and only if $ex = 0$, called the *right projection* of $a$ denoted by $RP(a)$. Similarly, the left projection $LP(a)$ is defined for each element $a$ in a Rickart $*$-ring $A$. A $*$-ring $R$ is said to be a *weakly Rickart $*$-ring*, if for any $x \in R$, there exists a projection $e$ such that (1) $xe = x$, and (2) if $xy = 0$ then $ey = 0$. Let $R$ be a $*$-ring and $x \in R$, we say that $x$ possesses a *central cover* if there exists a smallest central projection $h$ such that $hx = x$. If such projection $h$ exists, then it is unique, and is called the central cover of $x$, denoted by $h = C(x)$ or $h = C_R(x)$.

In [3], Birkenmeier introduced principally quasi-Baer (p.q.-Baer) rings as a generalization of quasi-Baer rings. Birkenmeier et al. [7] introduced principally quasi-Baer (p.q.-Baer) $*$-rings. A $*$-ring $R$ is said to be *a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring* if, for every principal right ideal $aR$ of $R$, $r_R(aR) = eR$, where $e$ is a projection in $R$. From the above definition, it follows that $l_R(aR) = Rf$ for a suitable projection $f$. Note that, $R$ is a quasi-Baer $*$-ring if and only if $M_n(R)$ ($n \times n$ matrix ring with $*$ transpose involution) is a quasi-Baer (hence p.q.-Baer) $*$-ring for all $n \geq 1$ [5, Proposition 2.6]. In general this statement is not true for Baer $*$-rings [10, Theorem 6]. Thus the class of p.q.-Baer $*$-rings is very much larger than that of Baer $*$-rings.

In [2], it is proved that every element of a Baer $*$-ring has a central cover. In the second section of this paper, we extend this result for p.q.-Baer $*$-rings. In fact, we generalize results of Baer $*$-rings to p.q. Baer $*$-rings. We have given an example of a $*$-ring $R$, which is a Rickart $*$-ring as well as a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, and an element $x \in R$ such that $RP(x)$ is not equal to $C(y)$ for any $y \in R$.

In the third section, we introduce the concept of weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings. We provide an example of an abelian p.q.-Baer $*$-ring which is not a weakly Rickart $*$-ring. Efforts are taken to obtain the exact difference between p.q.-Baer $*$-rings and weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings.

Berberian [2, page 33], raised the following Problem.

**Problem 1:** Can every weakly Rickart $*$-ring be embedded in a Rickart $*$-ring? with preservation of $RP$'s?

Berberian has given a partial solution to this problem. In [11], Thakare and Waphare gave more general partial solution to Problem 1. Till date this problem is open. In view of Problem 1, it is natural to raise the following problem.

**Problem 2:** Can every weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring be embedded in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring? with preservation of central covers?

In the last section we give the partial solution of Problem 2, analogous to the partial solution of Problem 1 given by Thakare and Waphare in [11].

## 2. Central Cover

In this section, we extend the results of Baer $*$-rings (proved in [2]) to p.q.-Baer $*$-rings. Also, we study the properties of a central cover of an element in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

According to Birkenmeier et al. [4], the involution of a $*$-ring $R$ is *semi-proper* if $aRa^* \neq 0$ for every nonzero element $a \in R$.

**Proposition 2.1.** *If $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, then $R$ has the unity element and the involution of $R$ is semi-proper.*

*Proof.* Since $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, there exists a projection $e \in R$ such that $r_R(0R) = R = eR$. As $e \in eR$, we have $e = er$ for some $r \in R$. Let $x \in R = eR$, so $x = er'$ for some $r' \in R$. Clearly $ex = e(er') = e^2r' = er' = x$. Hence $e$ is the left unity in $R$. Since $R$ is a

$*$-ring, $e$ is also the right unity in $R$. Thus $e$ is an unity in $R$. By [1, Proposition 2], $*$ is semi-proper. □

**Remark 2.2.** Note that in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, the projection which generates the right annihilator of a principal right ideal is central. For this, let $k$ be a projection in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring $R$ such that $r_R(zR) = kR$ for some $z \in R$. Let $r \in R$. Since $rk \in r_R(zR) = kR$, we have $rk = kr'$ for some $r' \in R$. Hence $krk = kr' = rk$. Thus $kr = (r^*k)^* = (kr^*k)^* = krk = rk$.

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let $R$ be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $x \in R$. Then $x$ has a central cover $e \in R$. Further, $xRy = 0$ if and only if $yRx = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$.*
*That is $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR) = l_R(Rx) = l_R(Re) = (1-e)R = R(1-e)$.*

*Proof.* Let $R$ be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $x \in R$. First we prove that $x$ has a central cover. Since $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, there exists a projection $g \in R$ such that $r_R(xR) = gR$. Let $e = 1 - g$. Consider $xe = x(1-g) = x - xg = x$. By Remark 2.2, $e$ is central. To prove $e$ is the smallest central projection with the property $xe = x$, suppose $e' \in R$ be a central projection such that $xe' = x$. So $x(1-e') = 0$. Thus $xR(1-e') = 0$. Consequently $(1-e') \in r_R(xR) = (1-e)R$. It follows that $1 - e' = (1-e)t$ for some $t \in R$. This gives $(1-e')(1-e) = (1-e)t = (1-e')$, that is $(1-e') \leq (1-e)$. Therefore $e \leq e'$. Thus $e = C(x)$.

If $xRy = 0$, then $y \in r_R(xR) = gR$. Hence $y = gr$ for some $r \in R$. As $g$ is a projection, we have $gy = g^2r = gr = y$. Therefore $ey = (1-g)y = y - gy = 0$. Conversely, suppose $ey = 0$. Then $y = y - ey = (1-e)y = gy$. Since $g \in r_R(xR)$, we have $xry = xrgy = 0$ for any $r \in R$. This yields $xRy = 0$. Similarly, there exists a central projection $f \in R$ such that, $fx = x$; and $yRx = 0$ if and only if $yf = 0$.

Now we prove that $e = f$. Since $xR(e-f) = 0$, we have $e(e-f) = 0$, that is $e = ef$. Similarly, since $(e-f)Rx = 0$, we have $(e-f)f = 0$, that is, $ef = f$. This yields $e = f$. Therefore $xRy = 0$ if and only if $yRx = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$.

Observe that, $r_R(xR) = (1-e)R$ and $l_R(Rx) = R(1-e)$. As $e$ is central, $1-e$ is also central. Consequently, $r_R(xR) = l_R(Rx) = R(1-e)$. To prove $r_R(eR) = R(1-e)$, let $z \in r_R(eR)$. Then $eRz = 0$, so $ez = 0 = ze$. Hence $z = z(1-e) \in R(1-e)$. Thus $r_R(eR) \subseteq R(1-e)$. Since $1-e$ is central, we have $R(1-e) \subseteq r_R(eR)$. This gives $r_R(eR) = R(1-e)$. In nutshell, we get $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR) = l_R(Rx) = l_R(Re) = (1-e)R = R(1-e)$. □

The following example shows that $RP$'s in Rickart $*$-rings are not necessarily central covers in p.q.-Baer $*$-rings.

**Example 2.4.** Let $A = M_2(\mathbb{Z}_3)$, which is a Baer $*$-ring (hence a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and a Rickart $*$-ring) with transpose as an involution. By [2, Exercise 17, page 10], the set of all projections $P(A)$ in $A$ is, $P(A) = \{0, 1, e, f, 1-e, 1-f\}$, where $e = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $f = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. Out of these only 0 and 1 are central projections in $A$. Note that the set of all right projections in $A$ is $P(A)$, whereas the set of all central covers in $A$ (being central) is $\{0, 1\}$. Therefore there is an element $x \in A$ such that $RP(x)$ is not equal to $C(y)$ for any $y \in A$. In particular, $r_A(x) \neq r_A(xA)$ for some $x \in A$.

Now we provide properties of a central cover of an element in p.q.-Baer $*$-rings.

**Theorem 2.5.** *If $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, then*
*(1) $C(x) = C(x^*)$; (2) $xRy = 0$ if and only if $C(x)C(y) = 0$.*

*Proof.* (1): Let $e = C(x^*)$ and $f = C(x)$. By the definition of central cover, $x^*e = x^*$ and hence $ex = x = fx$. Therefore $ex - fx = 0$. This gives $rex - rfx = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Since $e$ and $f$ are central, $erx - frx = 0$. That is $(e - f)rx = 0$ for all $r \in R$. It follows that $(e - f)Rx = 0$. By Theorem 2.3, we have $(e - f)f = 0$. Hence $ef = f$. Similarly, if $fx = x$ then $x^*f = x^* = x^*e$, this yields $ef = e$. Thus $e = f$.

(2): Let $e = C(x)$ and $f = C(y)$. If $xRy = 0$, then $ey = 0$. As $e$ is central, $eRy = 0$. Hence $ef = 0$. Conversely, suppose $ef = 0$. We have $eRy = 0$, that is, $ey = 0$. Thus $xRy = 0$. □

Projections $e,\ f$ in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring are called *very orthogonal* if $C(e)C(f) = 0$ (equivalently, in view of Theorem 2.5, $eRf = 0$).

**Corollary 2.6.** *Let $R$ be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring whose only central projections are $0$ and $1$. If $x, y \in R$, then $xRy = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$ or $y = 0$.*

*Proof.* If $x \neq 0$ and $y \neq 0$, then $C(x) = C(y) = 1$. Therefore $C(x)C(y) \neq 0$. By Theorem 2.5, $xRy \neq 0$. If $x = 0$ or $y = 0$ then by the definition of a central cover, we have $C(x) = 0$ or $C(y) = 0$. That is $C(x)C(y) = 0$. So by Theorem 2.5, $xRy = 0$. □

According to [1], a $*$-ring $R$ is said to satisfy the $*$-*Insertion of Factors Property* (simply, $*$-$IFP$) if $ab = 0$ implies $aRb^* = 0$ for all $a, b \in R$.

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let $R$ be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. If $C(xy) = C(x)C(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$, then $R$ is a Rickart $*$-ring. Moreover $RP(x) = C(x)$ for all $x \in R$.*

*Proof.* Let $x, y \in R$ be such that $xy = 0$. This gives $C(xy) = 0$. By assumption, we have $C(x)C(y) = 0$. Clearly $C(y) = C(y^*)$, therefore $C(x)C(y^*) = 0$. By Theorem 2.5, $xRy^* = 0$. Therefore $R$ satisfies $*$-$IFP$. By [1, Proposition 9], $R$ is reduced and hence a Rickart $*$-ring. Also, observe that $r_R(x) = r_R(xR)$ and hence $RP(x) = C(x)$ for all $x \in R$. □

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let $R$ be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and suppose $(e_i)$ is a family of projections that has a supremum, say $e$. If $x \in R$, then $xRe = 0$ if and only if $xRe_i = 0$ for all $i$.*

*Proof.* Let $x \in R$ and $C(x) = e'$. Suppose $xRe = 0$. As $C(x) = e'$, $e'e = 0$, which yields $e(1 - e') = e$. Therefore $e \leq (1 - e')$. Since $e_i \leq e$ for all $i$, we have $e_i \leq (1 - e')$ for all $i$. Hence $e_i(1 - e') = e_i$. This gives $e_ie' = 0$, that is, $e'e_i = 0$ for all $i$. As $C(x) = e'$, $xRe_i = 0$ for all $i$. By reversing the steps, we get the converse part. □

Let $R$ be a ring and $S \subseteq R$ be nonempty, then $S' = \{x \in R \mid xs = sx,\ \forall\ s \in S\}$. A subring $B$ of a $*$-ring $R$ is said to be $*$-subring, if $x \in B$ imply $x^* \in B$.

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let $R$ be a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring and $B$ be a $*$-subring of $R$ such that $B = (B')'$. If $(e_i)$ is a family of central projections in $B$ that possesses a supremum, say $e \in R$, then $e \in B$.*

*Proof.* Since $e_i \in B = (B')'$, we have $e_iy = ye_i$ for all $y \in B'$. Clearly $e_i(y - ye) = e_iy - e_iye = e_iy - ye_ie = e_iy - ye_i$ (as $e_i \leq e$). Since $e_iy = ye_i$, we get $e_i(y - ye) = 0$. Moreover, each $e_i$ is central, $e_iR(y - ye) = 0$. By Proposition 2.8, $eR(y - ye) = 0$. Hence $e(y - ye) = 0$, that is $ey = eye$ for all $y \in B'$. If $y \in B'$, then $y^* \in B'$. Therefore $ey^* = ey^*e$, which gives $ye = eye$. Consequently, $ey = ye$ for all $y \in B'$. Thus $e \in (B')' = B$. □

## 3. Weakly $p.q.$-Baer $*$-rings

In this section, we introduce weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings. By Proposition 2.1, p.q.-Baer $*$-rings has unity. What about the unit-less case? The answer, in principle, is to modify the arguments or attempt to adjoin the unity element. First, let us review the unit case.

**Proposition 3.1.** *A $*$-ring $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring if and only if*
*(a) $R$ has the unity element.*
*(b) For each $x \in R$, there exists a central projection $e \in R$ such that $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR)$.*

*Proof.* If $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, then by Proposition 2.1, $R$ has the unity element and by Theorem 2.3, the condition $(b)$ is satisfied. Conversely suppose that the conditions $(a)$ and $(b)$ are satisfied. Since $e$ is a central projection, $1-e$ is a central projection. So $(1-e)R \subseteq r_R(eR)$. Let $y \in r_R(eR)$. Then $ey = 0$. Hence $y = y - ey = (1-e)y$, so $y \in (1-e)R$. Therefore $r_R(eR) \subseteq (1-e)R$. This yields $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR) = (1-e)R$. Thus $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. □

The following example shows that the condition $(a)$ in Proposition 3.1 is necessary.

**Example 3.2** (Exercise 1, page 32, [2])**.** Let $R$ be a $*$-ring with $R^2 = \{0\}$. Then 0 is the only projection in $R$ and $r_R(xR) = r_R(0R) = R$ for every element $x \in R$, but $x0 \neq x$, when $x \neq 0$.

To study the unit-less case, we introduce the concept of weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings as follows.

**Definition 3.3.** A $*$-ring $R$ is said to be a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, if every $x \in R$ has a central cover $e \in R$ such that, $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$.

The following is an example of an abelian p.q.-Baer $*$-ring which is not a Rickart $*$-ring, see [8].

**Example 3.4.** Let $R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in M_2(\mathbb{Z}) \mid a \equiv d,\ b \equiv 0,\ \text{and } c \equiv 0 \ (mod\ 2) \right\}$. Consider involution $*$ on $R$ as the transpose of the matrix. In [8, Example 2(1)], it is shown that $R$ is neither right p.p. nor left p.p. (hence not a Rickart $*$-ring) but $r_R(uR) = \{0\} = 0R$ for any nonzero element $u \in R$. Therefore $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.

**Note that the ring $R$ in above example is weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring but not weakly Rickart $*$-ring (as $R$ has unity).**

By [2, Exercise 6, page 32], a weakly Rickart $*$-ring with finitely many elements is a Baer $*$-ring. We give an example of a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring (hence a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring) with finitely many elements which is not a Baer $*$-ring. First, we recall the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.5** ([10], Corollary 7)**.** *(i) $M_n(\mathbb{Z}_m)$ is a Baer $*$-ring for $n \geq 2$ if and only if $n = 2$ and $m$ is a square free integer whose every prime factor is of the form $4k+3$.*
*(ii) $\mathbb{Z}_m$ is a Baer $*$-ring if and only if $m$ is a square free integer.*

**Example 3.6.** Let $R = M_2(\mathbb{Z}_6)$, which is a $*$-ring with transpose as an involution. By Corollary 3.5(ii), $\mathbb{Z}_6$ is a Baer $*$-ring and hence $\mathbb{Z}_6$ is a quasi-Baer $*$-ring. By [6, Proposition 2.6], $R$ is a quasi-Baer $*$-ring and hence $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Note that $R$ contains finitely many elements. By Corollary 3.5(i), $R$ is not a Baer $*$-ring.

The following theorem leads to a characterization of weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let $R$ be a $*$-ring (not necessarily with the unity), $x \in R$ and $e \in R$ be a central projection. Then the following statements are equivalent.*
*(a) $C(x) = e$; and $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$.*
*(b) $xe = x$; and $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$.*

*Proof.* Observe that, if the statement $(a)$ holds then the statement $(b)$ holds. Conversely suppose statement $(b)$ holds. To prove statement $(a)$, it is sufficient to prove $e$ is the smallest central projection with $xe = x$. Let $e' \in R$ be the central projection such that $xe' = x$. Therefore $x(e - e') = 0$. As $e - e'$ is central, we have $xR(e - e') = 0$. By the assumption, we get $e(e - e') = 0$. Thus $e \leq e'$. □

**Corollary 3.8.** *$R$ is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring if and only if for every $x \in R$ there exists a central projection $e \in R$ such that (1) $xe = x$; (2) $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$.*

We give one more characterization of a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings as follows.

**Theorem 3.9.** *The following conditions on a $*$-ring $R$ are equivalent:*
*(a) $R$ is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.*
*(b) $R$ has a semi-proper involution, and for each $x \in R$, there exists a central projection $e$ such that $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR)$.*

*Proof.* $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$: Let $a \in R$ be such that $aRa^* = 0$. There exists a projection $e \in R$ such that (1) $e = C(a)$; (2) $aRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$. As $aRa^* = 0$, we have $ea^* = 0$, that is $ae = 0$. This gives $a = 0$. Hence $*$ is semi-proper. Let $y \in r_R(xR)$. Consequently, $xRy = 0$. So $ey = 0$. It follows that $eRy = 0$. This yields $y \in r_R(eR)$. Therefore $r_R(xR) \subseteq r_R(eR)$. Let $z \in r_R(eR)$. Then $eRz = 0$. Consider $xRz = xeRz = 0$. This gives $z \in r_R(xR)$. Hence $r_R(eR) \subseteq r_R(xR)$. Thus $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR)$.

$(b) \Rightarrow (a)$: Let $x \in R$ and $e$ be the central projection such that $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR)$. Since for all $y \in R$, $eR(y - ey) = 0$, we have $xR(y - ey) = 0$. Put $y = x^*$, we get $xR(x^* - ex^*) = 0$. Let $(x - xe)r(x^* - ex^*) \in (x - xe)R(x^* - ex^*) = (x - xe)R(x - xe)^*$, where $r \in R$. Clearly $(x - xe)r(x^* - ex^*) = (x - xe)rx^* - (x - xe)rex^* = xr(x^* - ex^*) = 0$. Therefore $(x - xe)R(x - xe)^* = 0$. As $*$ is semi-proper, we have $x - xe = 0$. Hence $x = xe$. If $xRy = 0$ then $y \in r_R(xR) = r_R(eR)$, so $eRy = 0$. Consequently $eey = 0$, that is, $ey = 0$. Thus, by Corollary 3.8, $R$ is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. □

**Theorem 3.10.** *The following conditions on a $*$-ring $R$ are equivalent:*
*(a) $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring.*
*(b) $R$ is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring with the unity.*

*Proof.* $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$: Follows from Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.3.

$(b) \Rightarrow (a)$: By the definition of a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, for each $x \in R$, there exists a projection $e$ such that (1) $C(x) = e$; (2) $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$. By similar steps as in Theorem 3.9, we have $r_R(xR) = r_R(eR)$. By Proposition 3.1, $R$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. □

## 4. Unitification

Theorem 3.10 distinguishes p.q.-Baer $*$-rings and weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings. With understanding of this difference, we try to adjoin the unity to weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings (that is

an unitification of weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-rings). This gives a partial solution of **Problem 2**.

First, we define an unitification of a $*$-ring as follows.

**Definition 4.1.** Let $R$ be a $*$-ring. We say that $R_1$ is an unitification of $R$, if there exists an auxiliary ring $K$, called the ring of scalars (denoted by $\lambda, \mu, ...$) such that,
1) $K$ is an integral domain with involution (necessarily semi-proper), that is, $K$ is a commutative $*$-ring with unity and without divisors of zero (the identity involution is permitted),
2) $R$ is a $*$-algebra over $K$ (that is, $R$ is a left $K$-module such that, identically $1a = a,\ \lambda(ab) = (\lambda a)b = a(\lambda b),$ *and* $(\lambda a)^* = \lambda^* a^*$).
Define $R_1 = R \oplus K$ (the additive group direct sum), thus $(a, \lambda) = (b, \mu)$ means, by the definition that $a = b$ and $\lambda = \mu$, and addition in $R_1$, is defined by the formula $(a, \lambda) + (b, \mu) = (a + b, \lambda + \mu)$. Define $(a, \lambda)(b, \mu) = (ab + \mu a + \lambda b, \lambda\mu)$, $\mu(a, \lambda) = (\mu a, \mu\lambda)$, $(a, \lambda)^* = (a^*, \lambda^*)$. Evidently $R_1$ is also a $*$-algebra over $K$, has unity element $(0, 1)$ and $R$ is a $*$-ideal in $R_1$.

The following lemmas are elementary facts about unitification $R_1$ of a $*$-ring $R$.

**Lemma 4.2.** *With notations as in Definition 4.1, if an involution on $R$ is semi-proper, then so is the involution of $R_1$*

*Proof.* Let $(a, \lambda) \in R_1$ be such that $(a, \lambda)R_1(a, \lambda)^* = (0, 0)$. So $(a, \lambda)(0, 1)(a^*, \lambda^*) = (aa^* + \lambda^* a + \lambda a^*, \lambda\lambda^*) = (0, 0)$, This gives $\lambda\lambda^* = 0$. As an involution of $K$ is semi-proper, we have $\lambda = 0$. Therefore, for any $r \in R$, $(a, 0)(r, 0)(a^*, 0) = (0, 0)$. That is $(ara^*, 0) = (0, 0)$. So $ara^* = 0$ for all $r \in R$. Hence $aRa^* = 0$. Also an involution on $R$ is semi-proper, we have $a = 0$. So $(a, \lambda) = (0, 0)$. Thus involution of $R_1$ is semi-proper. □

**Lemma 4.3.** *With notations as in Definition 4.1, let $x \in R$ and let $e$ be a projection in $R$. Then $C(x) = e$ in $R$ if and only if $C((x, 0)) = (e, 0)$ in $R_1$.*

*Proof.* Let $x \in R$. Suppose $e = C(x)$. So (1) $xe = x$; (2) $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$. Consider $(x, 0)(e, 0) = (xe, 0) = (x, 0)$. Suppose $(x, 0)R_1(b, \lambda) = (0, 0)$. Hence $(0, 0) = (x, 0)R_1(b, \lambda) = (xe, 0)R_1(b, \lambda) = (x, 0)(e, 0)R_1(b, \lambda) = (x, 0)R_1(e, 0)(b, \lambda) = (x, 0)R_1(eb + \lambda e, 0)$. This yields $xR(eb+\lambda e) = 0$. Thus $e(eb+\lambda e) = 0$. Consequently $eb+\lambda e = 0$, that is, $(e, 0)(b, \lambda) = (0, 0)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.7, $(e, 0)$ is a central cover of $(x, 0)$ in $R_1$. □

**Proposition 4.4.** *In a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring $R$, $xRy = 0$ if and only if $C(x)C(y) = 0$.*

*Proof.* Follows in the same way as the proof of the Part (2) of the Theorem 2.5. □

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let $R$ be a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. If $e$ and $f$ are projections in $R$, then there exists a central projection $g$ such that $e \leq g$ and $f \leq g$ (i.e. $g$ is an upper-bound of the set $\{e, f\}$).*

*Proof.* Suppose that $f$ is a central projection in $R$. Let $g = f+C(e-ef)$ and $h = C(e-ef)$, that is, $g = f+h$. As $f$ is a central projection, $C(f) = f$ and $fR(e-ef) = R(e-ef)f = \{0\}$. By Proposition 4.4, $C(f)C(e - ef) = 0$, consequently $fh = 0$. So $g = f + h$ is a central projection in $R$. Consider $fg = f(f + h) = f + fh = f$. Hence $f \leq g$. Since $h = C(e - ef)$, $(e-ef)h = e-ef$. Therefore $0 = (e-ef)h-(e-ef) = eh-e(fh)-e+ef = eh-e+ef$. Thus $e = ef + eh = e(f + h) = eg$. This yields $e \leq g$. Consequently $g$ a central projection which is an upper-bound of $\{e, f\}$. Moreover $g$ is the least upper bound as a central projection in the set of all upper bounds which are central projections. Now suppose $e$ and $f$ are

any two projections (not necessarily any of them to be central) in $R$. Let $g'$ be a central projection in $R$ (we can take $g' = 0$). Let $e'$ be a central projection which is an upper bound of $\{e, g'\}$ and $f'$ be a central projection which is an upper bound of $\{f, g'\}$. Let $g''$ be a central projection which is an upper bound of $\{e', f'\}$. Therefore $g''$ is an upper-bound of $\{e, f\}$. □

Now, we provide a partial solution to the unitification problem of weakly p.q.-Baer $*$ rings.

**Theorem 4.6.** *A weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring $R$ can be embedded in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, provided there exists, a ring $K$ such that,*
*(i) $K$ is an integral domain with involution,*
*(ii) $R$ is a $*$-algebra over $K$,*
*(iii) For any $\lambda \in K - \{0\}$ there exists a projection $e_\lambda \in R$ that is an upper bound for the central covers of the right annihilators of $\lambda$, that is, for $t \in R$, if $\lambda\, t = 0$ then $C(t) \leq e_\lambda$.*

*Proof.* Let $R_1 = R \oplus K$ (the additive group direct sum), with operations in Definition 4.1. First we prove that for any $a \in R$ and a nonzero scalar $\gamma \in K$, there exists a greatest central projection $g$ in $R$ such that $ag = \gamma g$. By the condition (iii), there exists a projection $e_\gamma \in R$ that is an upper bound for the central covers of the right annihilators of $\gamma$. Let $e_0 = C(a)$. By Theorem 4.5, there exists a central projection $e$ which is an upper bound of $\{e_0, e_\gamma\}$. Therefore $e$ is a projection in $R$ with $e_0 \leq e$, that is, $e_0 = e_0 e$. As $e_0 = C(a)$, we have $ae_0 = a$. It follows that $ae_0 e = ae$. Hence $a = ae$. Since $e$ is central, $a = eae \in eRe$. Therefore $a - \gamma e = eae - e\gamma e = e(a - \gamma e)e \in eRe$. Let $h = C(a - \gamma e)$. So $(a - \gamma e)h = a - \gamma e$. As $(a - \gamma e)e = a - \gamma e$, we have $h \leq e$, i.e., $h = he$. Observe that $g = e - h$ is a central projection. Consider $ag - \gamma eg = a(e - h) - \gamma e(e - h) = ae - ah - \gamma e + \gamma eh = (a - \gamma e) - (a - \gamma e)h = (a - \gamma e) - (a - \gamma e) = 0$. Also $\gamma eg = \gamma e(e - h) = \gamma e - \gamma eh = \gamma e - \gamma he = \gamma e - \gamma h = \gamma(e - h) = \gamma g$. This yields $0 = ag - \gamma eg = ag - \gamma g$. Thus $ag = \gamma g$.

Now we prove maximality of $g$. Let $k$ be a central projection in $R$ such that $ak = \gamma k$, that is, $ak - \gamma k = 0$. Since $a = ea$, $eak - \gamma k = 0$. Hence $e\gamma k - \gamma k = 0$. Consequently $\gamma(ek - k) = 0$. Let $f = C(ek - k)$. So $f$ is a central projection in $R$. Therefore $(\gamma f)(ek - k) = f\gamma(ek - k) = 0$. It follows that $(ek - k)(\gamma f) = 0$, which further yields $(ek - k)R(\gamma f) = 0$. Hence $f(\gamma f) = 0$, and consequently $\gamma f = 0$. This gives $C(f) \leq e_\gamma \leq e$. So $f \leq e$, that is, $f = fe$. As $e$ is a central projection and $f = C(ek - k)$, $(ek - k)Re = 0$. Therefore $fe = 0$, thus $f = 0$. Hence $ek - k = f(ek - k) = 0$. So $ek = k$, hence $k \leq e$. Since $ak = \gamma k$ and $k$ is central, we have $(a - \gamma e)Rk = 0$. Further $h = C(a - \gamma e)$, gives $hk = 0$. Consider $kg = k(e - h) = ke - kh = ke - 0 = k$, that is, $k \leq g$. Thus $g$ is the greatest central projection such that $ag = \gamma g$.

To show $R_1$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring, it is sufficient to prove that for every element $x \in R_1$ there exists a central projection $e \in R_1$ such that (1) $xe = x$; and (2) $xRy = 0$ if and only if $ey = 0$ (because of Corollary 3.8 and Theorem 3.10). Let $x = (a, \lambda) \in R_1$. If $\lambda = 0$, then by Lemma 4.3, $x$ has a central cover. Suppose $\lambda \neq 0$. By the above discussion, there exists a greatest central projection $g$ in $R$ such that $ag = (-\lambda)g$. So, $xg = (a, \lambda)(g, 0) = (ag + \lambda g, 0) = (0, 0)$. Let $e = 1 - g = (0, 1) - (g, 0) = (-g, 1)$. We prove that $C(x) = e$ in $R_1$. Consider $xe = (a, \lambda)(-g, 1) = (-ag + a - \lambda g, \lambda) = (\lambda g + a - \lambda g, \lambda) = (a, \lambda) = x$. Suppose $(a, \lambda)R_1(b, \mu) = (0, 0)$. So $(a, \lambda)(0, 1)(b, \mu) = (0, 0)$. Hence $(a, \lambda)(b, \mu) = (0, 0)$, that is, $(ab + \mu a + \lambda b, \lambda\mu) = (0, 0)$. This gives, $ab + \mu a + \lambda b = 0$ and $\lambda\mu = 0$. As $\lambda \neq 0$,

we have $\mu = 0$. This yields $ab + \lambda b = 0$. Let $f = C(b)$ in $R$. Hence (1) $fb = b$; (2) $yRb = 0$ if and only if $yf = 0$. Since $(a, \lambda)R_1(b, \mu) = (0, 0)$ for any $r \in R$, we have $(a, \lambda)(r, 0)(b, 0) = (0, 0)$. That is $(arb + \lambda rb, 0) = (0, 0)$. Therefore $arb + \lambda rb = 0$ for any $r \in R$. Consider $0 = arb + \lambda rb = arb + \lambda rfb = (a + \lambda f)rb$ for any $r \in R$. That is $(a + \lambda f)Rb = 0$, and consequently $(a + \lambda f)f = 0$. Therefore $af = -\lambda f$. Since $g$ is the greatest projection with this property, we have $f \leq g$, i.e., $f = fg$. Consider $ey = (-g, 1)(b, \mu) = (-g, 1)(b, 0) = (-gb + b, 0) = (-gfb + fb, 0) = (-fb + fb, 0) = (0, 0)$. Thus $R_1$ is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. □

A partial solution of **Problem 2** analogous to a partial solution of **Problem 1** given by Berberian [2], can be obtained as a corollary.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let $R$ be a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. If there exists an involutary integral domain $K$ such that $R$ is a $*$-algebra over $K$ and it is torsion free $K$-module, then $R$ can be embedded in a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring with preservation of central covers.*

*Proof.* By [11, Corollary 4], if $R$ is torsion-free then $R$ satisfies the condition $(iii)$ in Theorem 4.6. □

**Remark 2:** Let $A = C_\infty(T) \otimes M_2(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ (external direct product of the $*$-rings), where $C_\infty(T)$ denotes the algebra of all continuous, complex valued functions on $T$ that vanish at $\infty$. In [2], it is proved that, $C_\infty(T)$ is a commutative weakly Rickart $C^*$-algebra, when $T$ is a non-compact, locally compact, Hausdorff space. Hence $C_\infty(T)$ is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Since $M_2(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ is a Baer $*$-ring and hence it is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Therefore $A$ is a weakly p.q.-Baer $*$-ring. Also $A$ satisfies condition $(iii)$ in the Theorem 4.6. Since there does not exist an integral domain $K$ such that $A$ is torsion free $K$-module, so $A$ does not satisfies the hypotheses of Corollary 4.7. However, $A$ satisfies the hypotheses of the Theorem 4.6. Moreover, $A_1 = A \oplus \mathbb{Z}$ (operations as in unitification) is a p.q.-Baer $*$-ring containing $A$ that preserves central covers.

**Acknowledgment:** The first author gratefully acknowledges the University Grant Commission, New Delhi, India for the award of Teachers Fellowship under the faculty development program, during the $XII^{th}$ plan period (2012-1017).

## References

[1] Aburawash, Usama A., Saad Muhammad, *On biregular, IFP and quasi-Baer $*$-rings*, East-West J. Math. **16**(2) (2014), 182-192.
[2] Berberian S. K., *Baer $*$-Rings*, Grundlehren Math. Wiss. Band 195. Vol. **296**, Berlin: Springer (1972).
[3] Birkenmeier G. F., *Principally quasi-Baer rings*, Comm. Algebra **29**(2) (2001), 639-660.
[4] Gary F. Birkenmeier, Jae Keol Park, S. Tariq Rizvi, *Hulls of semiprime rings with applications to $C$-algebras*, J. Algebra **322** (2009) 327-352.
[5] Gary F. Birkenmeier, Jin Yong Kim and Jae Keol Park, *Polynomial extensions of Baer and quasi-Baer rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **159**(1) (2001), 25-42.
[6] Gary F. Birkenmeier, Jin Yong Kim and Jae Keol Park, *Polynomial extensions of Baer and quasi-Baer rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **159**(1) (2001), 25-42.
[7] Gary F. Birkenmeier, Jae Keol Park, S. Tariq Rizvi, *Extensions of Rings and Modules*, Birkhäuser, New York, (2013).
[8] Hong C. Y., Kim N. K., Kwak T. K., *Ore extension of Baer and PP rings*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **151**(3) (2000), 215-226.
[9] Kaplansky I., *Rings of operators*, W. A. Benjamin, Inc. New York-Amsterdam (1968).
[10] Thakare N. K. and Waphare B. N., *Baer $*$-rings with finitely many elements*, J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput. **26** (1998), 161-164.

[11] Thakare N. K. and Waphare B. N., *Partial solution to the open problem of unitification of a weakly Rickart $*$-rings*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **28**(2) (1997), 189-195.